

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 4, 2007. Claims 1-40 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1 and 19 are in independent form. Claims 1 and 19 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 4 has been amended to ensure consistency of terminology; no change in scope is either intended or believed effected by at least this latter change. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for reasons set forth in paragraph 4 of the Office Action. Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claim 4 to ensure that it complies with the requirements of Section 112 with special attention to the points raised in the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection of Claim 4 under Section 112 has been obviated and its withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14, 18-32 and 36-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,474 A (Carter et al.); and Claims 15-17 and 33-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,506 (Kaira et al.).

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 19 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of processing a digital signal identified by a

unique identifier in a distributed communication network composed of several communication apparatuses. The method includes the steps of storing at least a part of the data constituting the identified digital signal in a local storage located in one of the apparatuses; and managing two descriptors related to the unique identifier within the local storage, including a first descriptor which provides a description representing the structure and the organization of the data constituting the identified digital signal and a second descriptor which is dependent on the first descriptor and representative of the part of the data stored in the local storage.

Among other notable features of Claim 1 is managing two descriptors related to the unique identifier within the local storage, including a first descriptor which provides a description representing the structure and the organization of the data constituting the identified digital signal and a second descriptor which is dependent on the first descriptor and representative of the part of the data stored in the local storage.

Carter has been fully described in previous Office Actions and it is not believed necessary to repeat that description herein. The Office Action equates the file Inodes 110 described in Column 7, lines 43-50 and column 9, lines 31-35 (Figs. 4 and 5) of Carter with the first descriptor recited in Claim 1, and equates the stream descriptor described in column 7, lines 23-35 (and Figs. 4 and 5) of Carter with the second descriptor recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Carter defines an Inode as “a data structure that stores the file metadata” and states that it “represents the file in the file system” (see column 9, lines 31-35). As described in column 7, lines 43-49 of Carter, the Inode 110 includes various file attributes 112 and “contains an address that points to a data stream descriptor 114, and the data stream itself includes one or

more addresses 116, 118, 120, 122, and 124 that point to particular pages in the virtual addressable shared memory space 20.” Carter discusses that the type of metadata stored in an Inode includes “creation time, change time, last write time, last access time, pointers to stream descriptors, pointer to parent directory Inode....” (see column 9, lines 3-14). These attributes are quite different from the first descriptor recited in Claim 1 “which provides a description representing the structure and the organization of the data constituting the identified digital signal”.

Further, the second descriptor recited in Claim 1 identifies the parts of the digital signal data (the parts of the digital signal data being defined by the first descriptor) that are present in the local storage. The stream descriptors of Carter does not provide this type of information.

Accordingly, Applicants have found nothing in Carter that would teach or suggest “managing two descriptors related to the unique identifier within the local storage, including a first descriptor which provides a description representing the structure and the organization of the data constituting the identified digital signal and a second descriptor which is dependent on the first descriptor and representative of the part of the data stored in the local storage,” as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Carter.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants’ opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claim 19 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method Claim 1,

and is believed to be patentable over Carter for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Applicants also note that the Office Action's reliance on column 9, lines 15-18 of Carter as disclosing the recitation of Claim 2 of "a step of updating the second descriptor as a function of the data representative of the identified digital signal received and stored in the local storage" is inconsistent with its position with respect to Claim 1 because that passage discusses updating the Inode, which the Office Action equates with the first descriptor, not the second descriptor.

In addition, Applicants have found nothing in Carter that would teach or suggest "a step of sending from a server apparatus, a notification of availability of the identified signal to at least one client apparatus in the communication network, including the first descriptor of the identified signal," as recited in Claim 3. Column 4, lines 65-67 and column 5, lines 58-61, cited in the Office Action as disclosing this feature, merely discuss that the subsystems in Carter provide information to their respective nodes.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to

advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/

Jennifer A. Reda

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200